

RFP Questions and Clarifications Memorandum

To: Vendors Responding to RFP Number 3695 for the Mississippi Department of Public Safety (DPS) in cooperation with the Mississippi Commissioner of Insurance (MID) and the Mississippi Department of Revenue (DOR)

From: Craig P. Orgeron, Ph.D.

Date: October 23, 2012

Subject: Responses to Questions Submitted and Clarifications to Specifications

Contact Name: Renée Murray

Contact Phone Number: 601-432-8146

Contact E-mail Address: Renee.Murray@its.ms.gov

RFP Number 3695 is hereby amended as follows:

1. The Title page is being modified as follows:

First Paragraph:

INVITATION: Sealed proposals, subject to the attached conditions, will be received at this office until **October 25 30, 2012 @ 3:00 p.m. Central Time** for the acquisition of the products/services described below for Mississippi Department of Public Safety in cooperation with the Mississippi Commissioner of Insurance and the Mississippi Department of Revenue.

Third Box:

**PROPOSAL, SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO
RFP NO 3695
due October 25 30, 2012 @ 3:00 p.m.,
ATTENTION: Renée Murray**

2. Section VII Item 5 is being modified to read as follows:

Task	Date
First Advertisement Date for RFP	9/11/2012
Second Advertisement Date for RFP	09/18/2012
Deadline for Vendor's Written Questions	3:00 p.m. Central Time on 10/12/2012
Deadline for Questions Answered and Posted to ITS Web Site	10/23/2012
Open Proposals	3:00 p.m. Central Time on 10/30/2012
Evaluation of Proposals	10/31/2012 through 11/02/2012
On-Site Vendor Demonstrations	11/05/2012 through 11/06/2012
Final Evaluation/Selection	11/7/2012
Contract Negotiation	11/8/2012
Proposed Project Implementation Start-up	11/19/2012
Project Pilot Go-Live Deadline	01/01/2013

3. Section VII Item 10.19 is being modified to read as follows:

10.19 The search criteria must include fields for entering a date of insurance coverage. This field should allow past dates to be entered for investigative searches when determining if a person was insured during a designated time period. This should allow up to ~~18~~ 6 months of prior history for searching. Describe how Vendor's system meets this requirement.

4. Section VII Item 16.1.1 is being modified to read as follows:

16.1.1 Counts of queries resulting in "~~confirmed as not insured~~ unconfirmed".

5. Section VII Item 17.2 is being modified to read as follows:

17.2 The Vendor must provide a call center to provide assistance to Mississippi citizens who call with issues between the Vendor's data and the insurance companies that are providing the data. Describe how you will provide support to Mississippi citizens who need to clear up insurance reporting issues. This call center must be available continuously seven (7) days a week during the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM local Mississippi time.

6. Section VII Item 18.1.1 is being modified to read as follows:

18.1.1 Contract signing complete (November ~~4~~ 16, 2012)

7. Section VII Item 22.2.1 is being modified to read as follows:

22.2.1 Vendor must provide ongoing support services to must include toll-free telephone support during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Central Time, Monday through Friday twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. Vendor must describe the proposed plan.

8. Section VII Item 24.4.1.2 is being modified to read as follows:

24.4.1.2 Vendors will be notified of the State's request for an on-site demonstration on or before ~~October 29th, 2012~~ November 2nd, 2012.

9. Section VII Item 24.4.1.3 is being modified to read as follows:

24.4.1.3 If requested, Vendors must be prepared to make on-site demonstrations of system functionality and/or proposal clarifications to the evaluation team and its affiliates on ~~October 30th, 2012 or October 31st, 2012~~ November 5th, 2012 or November 6th, 2012 as requested by the State. Each presentation must be made by the project manager being proposed by the Vendor to oversee implementation of this project.

10. Exhibit A: Standard Contract Article 3.5 (p) is stricken.

Vendor must include in their proposal a response to each amended requirement as listed above. Vendor must respond using the same terminology as provided in the original requirements.

The following questions were submitted to ITS and are being presented as they were submitted, except to remove any reference to a specific vendor. This information should assist you in formulating your response.

Question 1: Page 6, Number 8.1 "The Vendor is required to submit one clearly marked original response and ten (10) identical copy/copies of the complete proposal, including all sections and exhibits, in three-ring binders."

- a. Can the proposals be bound using means other than three-ring binders?
Can coil, wire, etc. be used?

Response: The State will accept alternate binding as long as each proposal copy is bound separately.

Question 2: Page 12, Number 13, "For RFPs including professional services specifications, the Vendor will be required to provide and/or certify the following for each individual included in the Vendor's proposal:"

a. Does this RFP meet this requirement where the information listed below (including telephone number of employees) must be provided? We are unsure if this RFP includes “professional services specifications” as defined by the State.

Response: Yes.

Question 3: Page 20, Number 28.1, “When specifications require the Vendor to develop software for the State, the Vendor must acknowledge and agree that the State is the sole owner of such developed software with exclusive rights to use, alter, or distribute the software without restriction. This requirement applies to source code, object code, and documentation”.

a. The configuration of and a certain level of modification to our Insurance Verification Software and some new development is required in order to meet the unique requirements outlined in this RFP. Does the State expect to have any right to ownership of the previously developed packaged software used, provided or created by the Vendor?

Response: No, pre-existing software is not included in this requirement.

Question 4: Page 21, Number 29, “In installations where the Vendor’s intellectual property is modified and custom-tailored to meet the needs of the State, the Vendor must offer the State an application license entitling the State to use, and/or alter the software without restriction. These requirements apply to source code, object code and documentation.”

a. The configuration of and a certain level of modification to our Insurance Verification Software is required in order to meet the unique requirements outlined in this RFP. Does the State expect to have access to the source code or any right to ownership of the Vendor’s software?

Response: The State expects to have access only to the software developed specifically for the State.

Question 5: Page 21, Number 30, “The Vendor acknowledges and agrees that the term of all software licenses provided to the State shall be perpetual unless stated otherwise in the Vendor’s proposal.”

a. The term of the contract is 3 years with two optional 1 year renewals. Does the State expect that the term of the software provided surpass the contract period?

b. If the contract is terminated before the Vendor is paid or if funds are not available to pay the Vendor for all the services/software provided, would the State still have perpetual rights to the software?

Response: a) Please refer to Section 10 of Senate Bill 2631 which was included as Attachment B to the RFP. The contract will not be extended past the anticipated sunset of the requiring legislation.

b) The State does not expect the software to be used past contract termination and will negotiate license terms appropriate for the proposed business model at contract negotiation.

Question 6: Page 21, Number 32, “the State reserves the right to introduce new policy during the term of the contract resulting from this RFP and require the Vendor to comply with same in the event the industry introduces more secure, robust solutions or practices that facilitate a more secure posture for the State of Mississippi”.

a. Changes in required security have a direct impact to system costs. Does the State anticipate imposing new security requirements without providing the Vendor with the opportunity to increase its price?

Response: Yes.

Question 7: Page 22, Number 34, “ITS will provide third-party notice of requests for any such confidential exhibits to allow Vendor the opportunity to protect the information by court order as outlined in the ITS Public Records Procedures.”

a. The limitations outlined in the RFP regarding confidential information will greatly restrict the Vendor in providing a detailed response including system diagrams and screenshots as this is deemed proprietary information. In some cases, the RFP specifically asks for sample reports. Is it acceptable to provide less detailed information and reference that more specific information will be provided during the system demonstration?

Response: The referenced ITS Public Records Policy and Procedures at <http://dsitspe01.its.ms.gov/its/procman.nsf/f4ad43bd44ad9d8c86256daa0063e1f0/bb780b5a8360c3138625765d004e4aff?OpenDocument> contain provisions for protecting certain proprietary and confidential Vendor information. Providing less information than needed to adequately assess Vendor’s proposal may put the Vendor at a disadvantage.

Question 8: Page 33, Number 2.2, “MANDATORY: Access to MSVIVS will be initiated through the State’s Title Registration Network, which is used for registration, titling, and other motor vehicle transactions. The Title Registration Network is a mainframe system developed back in 1970. The data is housed at ITS and the system is developed and maintained in COBOL CICS. The tax collector offices throughout the state use the transactions available within the Title Registration Network for registration, titling and other motor vehicle transactions. Vendor must provide a daily file of insurance records created and placed on the ITS mainframe for state use.”

a. Is the State willing to remove the “Mandatory” designation from this requirement? Senate Bill 2631 requires the system to follow the IICMVA standards and doing so does not adequately support this approach for insurance verification within the Title Registration Network. Additionally, this approach limits the capabilities of the system to provide real-time insurance information and take advantage of the benefits of broadcasting. Instead, can the vendor provide an alternative method that would eliminate the need for daily reporting to the ITS mainframe and the related costs for housing such data?

Response: Senate Bill 2631 does require the system to follow the IICMVA standards but per Section 2 (3) (d), it also requires the system to “Be able to interface with the existing department and Department of Revenue systems”. This requirement must remain as MANDATORY. If an alternative method can be provided by the Vendor, Vendor should include in his response adequate information to allow the State to evaluate the alternative method.

Question 9: Page 33, Number 2.2.1, “Costs associated with hosting this file must be paid from revenue generated by the Vendor’s business model and must be included in Vendor’s Revenue Information Submission in Section VIII.”

a. When must these costs be paid for? Data may reside on the mainframe prior to sufficient funds being present in the fund. Can this cost be paid once adequate funds have accumulated?

Response: The State will work with the awarded Vendor to detail the billing and payment model upon award. Vendor must defer billing until monies accumulate in the fund and tailor recoupment of costs and earned revenue with the flow of monies into the fund.

Question 10: Page 33, Number 2.2.2, “Data Center charges should be calculated based on a charge for DASD storage at \$0.0065 per 1,000 trk-hours”

a. Please provide a definition of trk-hours.

b. How does the State intend on maintaining this data over the life of the project so that the Vendor can accurately estimate the cost associated with storing daily files of insurance records? Providing daily files to the mainframe will create unnecessary storage requirements unless the information is purged or only updated in the mainframe.

Response: a) A track-hour is calculated by multiplying the number of tracks allocated to a data set by the time period (in hours).

b) The file on the mainframe will be replaced daily with the latest file provided by the Vendor.

Question 11: Page 34, Number 3.4, “The Act contains fine and penalty provisions intended to generate sufficient revenue to cover the costs of operating the system and establishes a fund from which Vendor will be paid. Vendor will not be paid for any products or services until the system is in production.”

a. Can charges accrue prior to production that will be paid after the system is in production and funds are available?

b. Collection of fines and penalties may require significant changes in systems and processes for multiple State agencies. It is possible that even if the Vendor system is ready, the State is not ready or able to make the changes required to collect adequate funds. How will the vendor be paid in such a case?

Response: a) **Yes. The State will work with the awarded Vendor to detail the billing and payment model upon award. Vendor must defer billing until monies accumulate in the fund and tailor recoupment of costs and earned revenue with the flow of monies into the fund.**

b) **The State is committed to meeting the requirements laid out in Senate Bill 2631 and will work with the awarded Vendor to meet the mandated project schedule.**

Question 12: Page 34, Number 3.6, “MSVIVS may be implemented in phases, and the State has determined that the first phase will be implementing MSVIVS for law enforcement use through transactions handled by the State’s Law Enforcement Network and for use by County Tax Collector Offices through transactions handled by the State’s Title Registration Network.”

a. How does the State intend to utilize the capabilities of our system to provide real-time verification if the verification requests by the County Tax Collector Offices will be through the State’s Title Registration Network which will utilize a daily file (created from monthly or weekly book of business files from insurance companies) provided by the Vendor’s insurance verification system? Without real-time access to web services, the data provided will be from book of business files received from insurance companies. The IICMVA model and the insurers do not support a high frequency of data reporting (example weekly). The data residing in the Title Registration Network may be up to a month old which could unnecessarily prevent a customer from renewing their registration.

Response: **The Vendor must ensure that the file provided to DOR for use by the Title Registration Network system contains the most up to date information. The frequency in which the vendor receives information from the insurance companies is the responsibility of the vendor. Since DOR is expecting daily files from the Vendor, realistically the data should not be more than 1 day old. DOR will develop procedures to handle exceptions.**

Question 13: Page 34, Number 3.7, “SB2631 Section 4 (2) (d) anticipates ongoing monitoring of vehicle insurance status. The system will include the option to implement this monitoring activity in a later phase.”

a. How often will the insurers be required to report data – monthly or weekly? When will the regular data reporting start?

b. If the insurers do not report data on a regular basis, what action will the State take against the insurers? Will the State hold the vendor responsible for non-compliance of insurers?

c. Does the State have the authority to require insurance companies to report in a format and frequency different than what is defined by the IICMVA standard and related reporting guides?

Response: a) **This is to be determined. Vendor should propose a recommended strategy and timeline for meeting this requirement.**

b) **We refer the vendor to language found in subsection (4) of Section 2 of Senate Bill 2631, which states: “Every insurer shall cooperate with the department and the Department of Revenue in establishing and maintaining the system and shall provide access to motor vehicle liability policy status information to verify liability for a) A motor vehicle insured by that company that is registered in this state; and b) If available, a motor vehicle that is insured by that company or that is operated in this state regardless of where the motor vehicle is registered.” The State will enforce the law in a manner consistent with agency responsibilities.**

c) **Section 2(3) (a) of Senate Bill 2631 requires the system to be “in compliance” with the specifications and standards of the IICMVA and other applicable industry standards. It is our intention to comply with the law and implement a program that is compliant with IICMVA standards and other applicable industry standards.**

Question 14: Page 34, Number 3.8, “The State requires a business model whereby the Vendor provides MSVIVS products, implementation, and services, including changes to the Law Enforcement Network and support of changes to the Title Registration Network, at no up-front cost to the State. The business model must generate sufficient revenue to fully sustain the MSVIVS system, including ongoing operating costs, going forward.”

a. The collection of the civil penalties that put monies into the fund may require significant changes to the DOR/DPS systems and processes for registration suspension, clearance, and fine collection. When does the State plan to make these changes? Will the vendor be responsible for the cost of these changes? Will the cost of these changes come out of the Uninsured Motorist Identification Fund?

b. The State has provided an estimate for the changes required to integrate the Insurance Verification System with the Law Enforcement Network. Is this cost to be paid directly by the Vendor or will these costs be paid through the fund?

c. The changes required to the Law Enforcement Network may be performed prior to sufficient funds being present in the fund. Will this cost only be paid when sufficient funds have been accumulated?

Id. Is the State willing to consider an alternative approach where the Insurance Verification Web Portal is used initially in order to accumulate adequate funds in order to pay for the integration into the Law Enforcement Network?

Response: a) **The State is committed to meeting the requirements laid out in Senate Bill 2631 and will work with the awarded Vendor to meet the mandated project schedule. The State knows of no other changes to State systems that would be paid for by either the awarded Vendor or the Uninsured Motorist Identification Fund.**

b) **The awarded Vendor will be required to pay the switch Vendor when the work is completed.**

c) **The awarded Vendor will be required to pay the switch Vendor when the work is completed.**

d) **Law enforcement will not be able to use a web portal. Changes required to integrate the MSVIVS system with the Law Enforcement Network must be in place before the system is used by law enforcement.**

Question 15: Page 35, Number 4.2.1, “Costs incurred for modifications to the existing VQ/VR return must be borne by Vendor and are detailed in Exhibit C.”

a. Does the State expect the Vendor to pay these costs regardless of sufficient funds being present in the fund or the Vendor having been paid?

Response: Yes.

Question 16: Page 36, Number 4.2.5, “For the purposes of renewals, DOR has a nightly process that creates monthly renewal files for each county of all vehicles that are due a renewal. These files are created one month in advance in order to give the counties time to mail out renewal notices. At the time that DOR creates the monthly renewal file, they will access the MSVIVS file and update the DOR records accordingly with a Y or N indicating whether the VIN has insurance or not based on the information from the MSVIVS. At such time that the actual renewal transaction occurs within the county offices, the insurance information obtained from MSVIVS will already be present from the DOR data but the MSVIVS file will be accessed again just in case there has been a change in the status. If the insurance indicator is Y, the renewal

transaction will be allowed to go through. If it is N, the renewal transaction will not be allowed”

a. Our understanding is that the verification by the County Tax Collector Offices will be at registration renewal and will be a “hard-stop” preventing the customer from renewing and no suspension or file will be levied. Is this correct?

b. Would the state be willing to consider allowing the renewal or new registration to take place and initiating a backend verification process for those events? Given the current process defined in the RFP the State will have a high probability of receiving excessive false negatives and inconveniencing citizens who actually do have insurance.

Response: a) Yes.

b) No. DOR will develop procedures to handle exceptions.

Question 17: Page 36, Number 4.2.6 “Mississippi citizen’s access to MSVIVS will be from a public web portal using common browser technology. This interface will allow selection of carrier, entry of policy key and VIN for inquiry. The return will be a simple match/no-match response.”

a. If this function must be provided, will there be any specific data required by the customer to limit its use to only MS citizens verifying their own insurance?

Response: **The State will hold discussions with the awarded Vendor to address security concerns and to determine exactly how the web portal will function.**

Question 18: Page 37, Number 4.3 “Vendor must identify required changes to the Title Registration Network as part of this project. Vendor is expected to work with State staff to identify specific technical needs and specifications for connecting to and interacting with MSVIVS as part of Vendor’s proposal(s).”

a. Will the primary responsibility of identifying required changes to the Title Registration Network lie with the State or the Vendor?

b. Will the appropriate State technical resources be available to the Vendor in order to identify changes required to the Title Registration Network? When will these resources be made available to the Vendor?

Response: a) This will be a joint effort between DOR and the Vendor. Changes to the Title Registration system will only be made by DOR resources.

b) Yes, technical staff from DOR will be available to make changes as needed as soon as the contract is awarded.

Question 19: Page 37, Number 4.5, “Accuracy of matching motor vehicle records to insurance records must be no more than 5% of valid VIN records failing to match MSVIVS records before the first production use of the system”

a. This statement seems to require the Vendor to match 95% of the motor vehicle records provided to them by the State to insurance records. With the current uninsured motorist rate in MS, and commercial policies which are not required by law to be included, this rate cannot be achieved. Can the State please clarify this requirement?

Response: Before moving to production, some percentage of records must be assessed to determine if the response was correct or incorrect. Vendor should propose a statistical assessment of the system agreeable to the state to assess failure or success with the final method determined as a part of contract negotiation.

Question 20: Page 37, Number 4.10, “Vendor will generate and distribute notices to be sent to those who have not maintained insurance.”

a. When does the State anticipate starting this process? Will the \$300/\$400/\$500 civil penalties identified in the law apply?

b. Will the registrations be suspended prior to the notices being mailed? Will the citizens contact the vendor or the State to clear the suspensions?

c. Who will be responsible for collecting the files – the Vendor or the State?

Response: a) The State has not determined when this phase will be scheduled. Vendor should propose a timeline as a part of the project plan.

b) Specifics of how and when registrations will be suspended have not been worked out yet. The State anticipates that the process will provide a citizen resolution period before the registration is suspended. The State further anticipates that citizens would contact DOR or the court of proper jurisdiction to clear suspensions. However, if during the course of regular tag renewal, renewal is denied due to MSVIVS indicating there is no insurance coverage on the vehicle, the citizen will be directed to contact the awarded Vendor and or their insurer for resolution.

c) The State anticipates fines being collected through the court system.

Question 21: Page 39, Number 8.1, “Provide a list of the Mississippi insurance providers, if any, from whom your company currently receives data.”

a. Will the State provide a list of licensed MS insurance companies so that this may be compared against the Vendor’s list of reporting insurance companies?

Response: A list of licensed MS insurance companies is attached as Exhibit A to this memorandum.

Question 22: Page 39, Number 8.1, “It will be the Vendor’s responsibility to coordinate the collection of and/or interface to insurance data that Mississippi needs for its verification program. The Vendor must gain working relationships with companies that sell liability insurance to Mississippi citizens to access vehicle insurance data.”

a. Senate Bill 2631 requires insurance company participation and the Vendor will utilize their relationships with insurance companies to being the reporting process, however, the Vendor cannot force the insurance companies to report. Will the State be responsible for enforcing this reporting requirement? How will the State enforce this requirement?

Response: a) We refer the Vendor to language found at subsection (4) of Section 2 of Senate Bill 2631, which states: “Every insurer shall cooperate with the department and the Department of Revenue in establishing and maintaining the system and shall provide access to motor vehicle liability policy status information to verify liability for a) A motor vehicle insured by that company that is registered in this state; and b) If available, a motor vehicle that is insured by that company or that is operated in this state regardless of where the motor vehicle is registered.” The state will enforce the law in a manner consistent with agency responsibilities.

Question 23: Page 40, Number 8.4, “The Vendor’s proposed application must be able to verify insurance for the vehicles identified in the attached Senate Bill 2631 Section 6.1 a-f and 8. Confirm that insurance coverage can be determined for these types of vehicles within your application. If there are any vehicle types that cannot be handled, list them and explain why they cannot be verified.”

a. Senate Bill 2631 specifically excludes the reporting of Commercial and Fleet insurance policy information by insurance companies. The RFP requirement seems to require the Vendor to verify insurance for fleet and commercial vehicles. Can the State confirm that this is what the RFP requires?

Response: Section 6 (2) of the bill states that insurers of commercial vehicles “may participate on a voluntary basis.” If insurers choose to provide information on commercial vehicles, the proposed system should report the information.

Question 24: Page 40, Number 8.7, “Vendor’s system must identify how binder of insurance is processed, and how subsequent coverage information is processed. Describe how your system manages this process.”

a. Senate Bill 2631 specifically excludes verification of vehicles with binder of insurance. Is the State requiring that Binders be reported by insurance companies to the insurance verification system?

Response: **Section 6 (1) (d) of Senate Bill 2631 excludes only “an insurance binder that has not been entered into the system at the time the verification system is accessed”.**

Question 25: Page 41, Number 9.1, “Mississippi requires that a process can be run which performs analysis between the Vendor’s insurance data and the Mississippi vehicle registration data.”

a. Will the State clarify what type of analysis is expected between the insurance and registration data?

Response: **Vendor should describe the types of analysis and reports available with Vendor’s proposed solution.**

Question 26: Page 41, Number 9.6.1, “Vehicles that were uninsured as of the last batch process execution and are still uninsured.

a. Will the State clarify what “batch process” is being referred to?

Response: **This process is intended to identify vehicles noted as uninsured across succeeding batches; i.e., the vehicle was uninsured on the last batch and remains uninsured in later batches.**

Question 27: Page 42, Number 10.3, “The Vendor’s system for the web-based online verification service should use the specifications and standards of the Insurance Industry Committee on Motor Vehicle Administration (IICMVA) as well as with other applicable industry standards as guidelines. Specify how the solution offered meets those guidelines. Note that the State’s requirements override these industry guidelines, in the event of a conflict.”

a. Some requirements in the RFP will require the vendor to use reporting standards that are not IICMVA compliant. For example, excluded drivers, restricted policies where only a named driver is insured and policy expiration dates, all are listed as requirements among others. Senate Bill 2631 requires insurance reporting requirements to be IICMVA compliant. Will the State confirm that it has the authority and will enforce insurance company participation with an Insurance Verification System that is not IICMVA compliant?

Response: **a) Subsection (3) a) of Section 2 of Senate Bill 2631 requires the system to be “in compliance” with the specifications and standards of the IICMVA and other applicable industry standards. It is our intention to comply with the**

law and implement a program that is based on IICMVA standards and other applicable industry standards.

Question 28: Page 43, Number 10.12, “The Vendor's system must allow a search by insurance policy number. Policy number needs to be part of the response when searching by VIN, plate, or policy number. Identify if Vendor’s system has this capability and describe how Vendor’s system ensures the policy number in its database is recorded in the same format as the insurance company prints on the paperwork provided to customer. Also describe how Vendor’s system can use this information to uniquely determine if the person and vehicle combination is insured.”

a. The IICMVA standard does not support the capability of determining if a person and vehicle combination is insured. Is the State requiring the vendor to support this functionality?

b. The IICMVA standard for web services does not support the verification of the insurance by policy number. Is the State requiring the vendor to support this functionality?

Response: **a) Vendor should describe the capabilities of the proposed system.**

b) Vendor should describe the capabilities of the proposed system.

Question 29: Page 43, Number 10.14, “The system must be capable of broadcasting a query to a specific insurance company or to all insurance companies reporting for Mississippi if insurance is not found in the Vendor's data repository.”

a. Smaller local companies are often unable to host Web Services. Is there any exception for smaller companies?

b. Will the vendor be held responsible for non-compliant companies who are unable or unwilling to host web services to support the system?

c. Not all insurance companies support broadcasting. Will this be a new requirement for insurance companies or is the Vendor only required to broadcast to those that allow broadcasting?

Response: **a) See Senate Bill 2631 Section 2 (3) (g) “The system must...provide a means by which low-volume insurers that are unable to deploy an online interface with the system can report insurance policy data to the department, the Department of Revenue or their designee for inclusion in the system;**

b) No. The responsibility of the Vendor will be to inform the appropriate state agencies of non-compliance with the provisions of the law.

c) The Vendor will only be required to broadcast to those insurers that allow for broadcasting.

Question 30: Page 44, Number 10.17, “The system must provide real-time access to insurance company customer book-of-business data (in addition to batch access identified elsewhere). This can be used by insurance companies that are capable of responding real-time. Vendor will describe how this real-time access will be provided.”

a. Will the State provide further clarification to this requirement?

Response: a) **Vendor should describe the proposed system’s capability for providing real-time access to insurance company data.**

Question 31: Page 44, Number 10.19, “This should allow up to 18 months of prior history for searching.”

a. The IICMVA standard for web services only supports 6 months of prior history. Does the State expect the insurers and the vendor to support verification requests prior to this?

Response: a) **Please refer to amendment #3 above.**

Question 32: Page 47, Number 16.1.1, “Counts of queries resulting in “confirmed as not insured”

a. Will the State further clarify this requirement? We do not understand what “confirmed as not insured” means.

Response: **Please refer to amendment #4 above.**

Question 33: Page 48, Number 17.2 and 17.3, “The Vendor must provide a call center to provide assistance to Mississippi citizens who call with issues between the Vendor’s data and the insurance companies that are providing the data. Describe how you will provide support to Mississippi citizens who need to clear up insurance reporting issues. This call center must be available continuously during the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM local Mississippi time”

a. Will the Call Center only be available during business days or does this also include weekends? What about State holidays?

Response: **The Call Center should be available 365 days a year.**

Question 34: Page 49, Number 18.1.1, “Contract signing complete (November 1, 2012)”. However, Page 38, Number 5 has the “Contract Negotiation” date as “11/2/2012”.

Plus the RFP states that the Contract can only begin following a 5 day protest period.

a. What is the estimated date for Contract signing? When will the vendor be able to begin work on the contract?

Response: Please refer to amendment #6 above. Vendor will be able to begin work upon contract execution.

Question 35: Page 49, Number 18.1.5, “Provide ability for Mississippi’s Law Enforcement Network related applications able to request insurance verification information from the Vendor supplied system, including access by Mississippi law enforcement officers (January 1, 2013)”

a. How will these users access the system? The changes to the Law Enforcement Network will not be in place until July 1, 2013. Will these requests come through the Insurance Verification System Web Portal?

Response: a) Senate Bill 2631 Section 2 (3) (k) states that the System must “Be installed and operational not later than July 1, 2013, following an appropriate testing period of not less than six (6) months.” Changes to the Law Enforcement Network will not be used in a production environment until July 1, 2013, but must be in a test environment prior to production use. The State will work with the awarded Vendor to define a test plan to meet the requirements of the bill.

Question 36: Page 49, Number 18.1.2, “Dedicated test system for the State is operational with enough insurance companies reporting data to represent at least 60% of Mississippi’s insurance business for vehicles (January 1, 2013)

a. The Proposed Project Implementation Start-Up is 11/12/2012 (Page 38 of the RFP). Following approval of project documents including the Insurance Company Reporting Guide which defines the file format, insurance companies will have less than 45 days to begin reporting. This time period will cover key holidays which usually limit key insurance company resources. We feel that insurance companies will not be able to meet this deadline even if the file format is not changed from the IICMVA standards. If some of the requirements listed in the RFP are upheld, changes to this format will be required. Will the State provide additional time for insurance companies to begin reporting data and waive the 60% requirement?

Response: a) Senate Bill 2631 Section 2 (3) (k) states that the System must “Be installed and operational not later than July 1, 2013, following an appropriate testing period of not less than six (6) months.”

Question 37 Page 49, Number 18.1.7, “Provide a verification tool ready for production use by the State for use in an advisory capacity (January 1, 2013)”

a. Detailed in 18.1.2, only a test system will be available on January 1, 2013 and at most only 60% of insurance companies will be reporting. How does the State intend on using the insurance verification system in a production capacity for advisory use?

Response: **During the testing pilot period, the MSVIVS will not take precedence over the insurance card information.**

Question 38: Page 49, Number 18.1.8, “Provide the ability in test for the State’s Title Registration Network to request insurance verification information. Record lack of insurance at registration renewal (February 1, 2013)”

a. On February 1, 2013 the system will not have full participation by insurance companies. How does the State intend on recording lack of insurance at renewal without full insurance company participation? What will this be used for? Without full participation the system will receive an excessively high number of unconfirmed responses.

Response: **The State understands that we will not have full participation at this time. This requirement is to ensure that the Vendor will make a file available of the information they have received so that DOR can begin testing. We also understand that we will have a high number of unconfirmed responses during this testing period.**

Question 39: Page 52, Number 21.1 states “The Vendor must provide adequate training for core groups of State employees at the appropriate step of each implementation phase as part of the implementation process.” Number 21.2 states “Vendor must also provide initial training of all law enforcement officers and dispatchers statewide, court personnel, and other key personnel as identified by the State.”

a. Can the State provide the total number of users who will have to be trained?

b. Can the State provide an estimated number of users for each user group?

c. Can the State provide the total number of training sessions that will have to be provided? Does this training have to be provided in a classroom setting?

d. Will the State provide the training sites and infrastructure? Or will the vendor be responsible for arranging for and paying for the training sites and configuration?

e. How does the State expect the Vendor to train Law Enforcement Officers when the insurance system will be integrated with the existing Law Enforcement

Network? Is the Vendor to provide training on using the Law Enforcement Network?

f. Does training to Law Enforcement include State, County and Municipalities?

Is the State willing to consider the Vendor providing train-the-trainer training, or self-paced training?

g. Will the State identify “other key personnel” that may have access to the system?

Response: a) The State estimates a total of 5,000 users to be trained.

a) Approximately 3,000 law enforcement users; from the DOR perspective, 82 counties with 104 or more locations and approximately 400 users; Court and other personnel make up the difference.

b) Vendor should provide a plan, based on its experience to adequately train and implement a state-wide system with many users.

c) The Vendor will be responsible.

d) Based on its experience, Vendor should propose a plan to adequately train law enforcement to interpret the new information presented by the proposed solution. Vendor will not be expected to train law enforcement personnel in basic operation of the Law Enforcement Network.

e) Yes.

f) Vendor should provide a plan, based on its experience to adequately train and implement a state-wide system with many users.

g) Court users make up the bulk of this category.

Question 40: Page 55 Number 24.3.1 states “Vendor providing the highest payments to the State will receive the maximum number of cost points.” The vendor payments are defined in Section VIII (RFP Page 57) of the RFP that asks for “Total Projected Revenue” and “Net Revenue”?

a. Different vendors can provide widely varying revenue projections. Vendors can inflate the Total Projected Revenue to inflate the Net Revenue, and get maximum number of cost points. How will the evaluation committee handle variations in the Revenue Projections for the evaluation?

b. Will the selected vendor be held to the revenue projections? What is the consequence of the Vendor not meeting the revenue projections?

Response: a) The State will evaluate Vendor proposals and proposed business models for reasonableness based on the assumptions provided by the Vendor as required in RFP Section VII 3.8.

b) Vendor will be paid only if sufficient revenue accumulates in the fund. The only consequence of failure to meet revenue the State can identify is delayed or unmade payments made to the awarded Vendor.

Question 41: Page 55-56: Number 24.4.1.2 states that “Vendors will be notified of the State’s request for an on-site demonstration on or before October 29th, 2012.” Number 24.4.1.3 states “If requested, Vendors must be prepared to make on-site demonstrations of system functionality and/or proposal clarifications to the evaluation team and its affiliates on October 30th, 2012 or October 31st, 2012 as requested by the State.”

a. Can the State provide more notice to the vendors so that they can make the appropriate travel arrangements?

Response: Please refer to amendment #9 above for a revised schedule.

Question 42: Page 66: Article 3.2 (e) states “meet with MDPS on a regular basis at a mutually agreeable time, and as otherwise requested by MDPS, to discuss the status of the project”

b. Do these meetings have to be in person or can they be conducted over the telephone?

Response: a) Normally these can be handled by phone with periodic on site meetings.

Question 43: Page 66: Article 3.3 states “The parties understand and agree that the project shall be structured with interim deliverables as set forth in the agreed upon project work plan so as to allow MDPS an opportunity to accept or reject the deliverables, including but not limited to, specifications, requirement definitions, process designs, data analyses, web layouts, screen layouts, and report layouts. The actual customizations shall not begin until after MDPS has communicated its conceptual approval of the results the Licensor plans to provide. MDPS shall have ten (10) business days to review interim materials, which review period can only be reduced by mutual agreement of the Licensor and MDPS.”

a. With the project beginning mid-November 2012 (at the earliest) and the pilot system to be available on Jan 1, 2013 – can MDPS reduce the review period for deliverables?

Response: The State agrees that the review period for deliverables should be reduced in order to meet the timeline mandated by Senate Bill 2631 and will work with

the awarded Vendor to mutually agree on the allotted review period for each deliverable. The State is committed to reviewing provided information as timely as possible.

Question 44: Page 66: Article 3.5 b) states “Ensuring that the host site complies with Priority One of the World Wide Web Consortium’s (W3C’s) Web Accessibility Initiative and guidelines in Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act that are not covered in W3C Priority;”

a. Will MDPS be willing to exempt this article for portions of the application website that require enhanced security?

Response: Yes. Only public-facing aspects of the system will be subject to this requirement.

Question 45: Page 67: Article 3.5 (L) states “Participating with MDPS in disaster recovery planning and testing based on a mutually agreed upon schedule;”

a. How often does MDPS typically perform disaster recovery testing? Will this have to be done multiple times during the contract?

b. Is there a requirement for multiple redundant hosting sites to be provided in case of catastrophic disaster at the primary hosting site?

c. What are the State’s expectations in actually performing a disaster recovery test? Can the state provide an overview of its current testing process?

Response: a) Annually. Yes.

b) Vendor should provide their plan for providing for business resumption in case of disaster.

c) Vendor should describe Vendor’s approach to disaster recovery testing. Please find below an overview of the State’s current practices.

INFRASTRUCTURE DISASTER RECOVERY

ITS currently has a contract with IBM Business Recovery Services to facilitate a recovery should a significant disaster strike. The coverage includes:

- Six weeks of hot-site access
- Six months of cold-site access
- Mainframe capacity to handle both ITS customers and MDHS
- Mainframe peripherals such as disk storage and tape drives
- Open Systems capacity to handle mission-critical UNIX and Windows applications including E-mail services

- Routers, switches, and channel extenders to switch the Metro Area Network and Statewide Frame Relay/ATM Backbone Network to the hot-site
- Reserve DS1s and Internet VPNs to connect to the hot-site
- Internet access

Testing is done annually to demonstrate the ability to provide production ready access to agency data using the IBM Business Recovery facilities.

Question 46: Page 67: Article 3.5 (P) states “Maintaining the host site, with the cost for such support, maintenance, and hosting for years following the initial three (3) year period not increasing annually beyond five percent (5%) or the percent increase in the consumer price index for all Urban Consumers, US City Average (C.P.I.-U) for the preceding year, whichever is less”

a. It is unclear which part of the vendor’s costs the 5% limit applies to. Is the vendor supposed to provide separate hosting costs as part of the response?

Response: **This Article has been stricken. Please refer to amendment #10 above.**

Question 47: Page 68: Article 3.5 (W) states “Ensuring that upon termination or expiration of this Agreement that transition of the site from the Licensor to MDPS or to a successor host will be accomplished at no expense to MDPS, and with minimal interruption of the site’s accessibility and insignificant changes in the site’s appearance and functionality.”

a. Does this refer to the hosting site or the web site?

b. Will the Licensor have to provide the application or the application code to the Licensee or the Licensor’s successor as part of this Article?

Response: **a) Both.**

b) The State’s data and any application code developed specifically for the State must be provided as a part of this Article.

Question 48: Page 68: Article 4.4 states “.... In the event that MDPS or an Active User is unable to achieve the 99% application availability during any given month, excluding scheduled maintenance, required repairs, and unavailability due to causes beyond the control of Licensor, the Licensor shall reimburse MDPS twenty five percent (25%) of the monthly ASP hosting fees for each twenty-four (24) hour day during which there were any incidents of unavailability. Licensor shall maintain the server at a secured location with restricted access.” We have the following questions about this article.

- a. If the application availability goes below the 99% for a given day but has not crossed the threshold for the month, will the Licensor have to reimburse the 25% of the monthly fees for that day?
- b. Is the State willing to lower the 25% fee to a lower percentage?
- c. Does the unavailability of insurance company web services count as application unavailability?

Response: a) The State realizes, given the nature of the business model the State requires, that the Vendor is assuming the bulk of the risk in the implementation of this system and that this Article might warrant further consideration. As directed in Section V of the RFP, Vendor should note any exceptions Vendor considers warranted. The State will address those exceptions as laid out in the RFP.

b) See the response to Question 48 a) immediately above.

c) No.

Question 49: Page 71: Article 7.3 states “...In the event Licensor is unable to repair or replace the Software within the mutually agreed upon time frame after receipt of notice of the Defect, MDPS shall be entitled to a full refund of fees paid and shall have the right to terminate this Agreement in whole or in part as provided for in the Termination Article herein....”

- a. If a defect is noticed by the Licensee well after the acceptance period, will the Licensor still have to provide a full refund of ALL fees paid to the Licensee?

Response: As directed in Section V of the RFP, Vendor should note any exceptions Vendor considers warranted. The State will address those exceptions as laid out in the RFP.

Question 50: Page 72: Article 7.10 states “Licensor represents and warrants that the host site provided by the Licensor shall be reasonably expandable and scalable so MDPS can add and support additional business functions and users over time. It is understood and agreed that any standard revisions, enhancements, improvements, and upgrades to the licensed Software and host site equipment during the term of this Agreement, including operating system, database management system, and other software, shall be provided by Licensor to MDPS at no additional cost to MDPS.”

- a. The above article seems to indicate that unlimited enhancements to support additional business functions and users may need to be provided by the vendor at no additional cost to MDPS. Can this article be modified to limit the scope of the

enhancements and to allow for additional cost if the enhancements exceed a threshold?

Response: **The host of the Vendor’s system will be required to upgrade and maintain patches on Operating Systems, Database, and web-services, etc.**

Question 51: Page 73: Article 7.13 states “Licensor represents and warrants that the system provided pursuant to this Agreement will pass both internal security audits and independent security audits.”

a. Will the Licensor have to perform just one set of security audits when the system goes into production? Or will multiple security audits have to be performed throughout the life of the contract? If multiple security audits have to be performed, how many and how frequently will they have to be performed?

Response: **While there is no specific audit schedule laid out to meet this requirement, in an effort to ensure that State hosted applications meet this requirement, the State currently performs monthly vulnerability scans on Internet facing applications. Annual comprehensive security audits, which include a manual review of configuration, policies, and procedures, are also conducted. As noted elsewhere in this document, and as directed in Section V of the RFP, Vendor should note any exceptions Vendor considers warranted. The State will address those exceptions as laid out in the RFP.**

Question 52: Page 74: Article 8.3 states “Any person assigned by Licensor to perform the Services hereunder shall be the employee of Licensor, who shall have the sole right to hire and discharge its employee. Licensee may, however, direct Licensor to replace any of its employees under this Agreement.”

a. Will the Licensee have to provide “just cause” to the Licensor to replace its employees under this Article?

Response: **No.**

Question 53: Page 76: Article 13.1 (d) states “MDPS may terminate this Agreement in whole or in part for any reason without the assessment of any penalties after giving thirty (30) calendar days written notice specifying the effective date thereof to Licensor.” Article 13.2 on the same page states “In the event MDPS terminates this Agreement, Licensor shall receive just and equitable compensation for Services rendered by Licensor and accepted by MDPS prior to the termination.”

a. If MDPS terminates the agreement but there are not enough monies in the Uninsured Motorist Identification Fund, then how will the vendor be paid for services that have been rendered and accepted? Will the charges accrued through the termination date be paid when the fund has the money?

Response: **The State will continue to pay for services that have been rendered and accepted as long as monies continue to accrue in the Fund.**

Question 54: Page 77: ARTICLE 18 HOLD HARMLESS states “To the fullest extent allowed by law, Licensor shall indemnify, defend, save and hold harmless, protect and exonerate Licensee, ITS and the State, its Board Members, officers, employees, agents and representatives from and against any and all claims, demands, liabilities, suits, actions, damages, losses, costs and expenses of every kind and nature whatsoever, including without limitation, court costs, investigative fees and expenses, attorney fees and claims for damages arising out of or caused by Licensor and/or its partners, principals, agents, employees or subcontractors in the performance of or failure to perform this Agreement.”

a. Will the Licensor (Vendor) have to indemnify the Licensee (the State, ITS, etc.) in the case of lawsuits filed by citizens related to suspensions and penalties based on the insurance status indicated by the system?

b. Will the vendor be held harmless if the incorrect insurance status is provided due to errors in data or systems of insurance companies?

c. Is the State willing to remove this clause from the Contract?

Response: **As directed in Section V of the RFP, Vendor should note any exceptions Vendor considers warranted. The State will address those exceptions as laid out in the RFP.**

Question 55: Page 80-81: Article 32.2 states “The contract made by and between the parties hereto shall consist of, and precedence is hereby established by the order of the following:

A. This Agreement signed by the parties hereto;

B. Any exhibits attached to this Agreement;

C. RFP No. 3695 and written addenda, and

E. Licensor’s Proposal, as accepted by the State, in response to RFP No. 3695.”

a. Is there a bullet “D” missing from the above article?

Response: **Yes. This will be corrected before contract negotiations begin.**

Question 56: Page 82: Article 39.2 states “Licensor shall also provide unlimited email and toll-free telephone technical support in the operation of the Software Products twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week. Licensor shall respond by telephone within one (1) hour to requests for support services.” However, RFP Page 52 – Number 22.1.2 states “Warranty must cover, at minimum, one (1) hour response to all service-related calls or e-mails during prime-shift hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:00

p.m. Central Time, Monday through Friday. Vendor must describe the proposed warranty.”

a. Is the vendor supposed to provide 24/7 technical support as stated in Article 39.2 or 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. technical support as stated in RFP Number 22.1.2?

b. If vendor is supposed to provide 24/7 technical support, are these calls limited to Mississippi’s technical personnel or will this toll free line be open to any system user?

Response: a) Please refer to amendment #7 above.

b) Calls will be limited to technical State personnel from key State agencies.

Question 57: Page 93-94: Section 7 (1) of SENATE BILL NO. 2631 states “the Commissioner of Public Safety, the Commissioner of Revenue or a court of proper jurisdiction shall suspend the vehicle registration and/or the owner's or the operator's driving privilege and shall impose a civil penalty in an amount of Three Hundred Dollars (\$300.00) upon a first conviction, in an amount of Four Hundred Dollars (\$400.00) upon a second conviction and in an amount of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) upon a third or subsequent conviction. If suspended, the registration or driving privilege shall not be reinstated until the owner has motor vehicle liability insurance in at least the minimum amounts required under Section 63-15-3(j) and has paid the civil penalties imposed. ”

a. Which Department (DPS, DOR, ITS, or other department) shall impose the civil penalty?

b. Which Department will track the first, second, and third convictions? When will the related system changes be made and who will be responsible for making them? Who will be responsible for paying the cost of these changes?

c. Who will be responsible for collecting the civil penalties?

d. Will the vehicle registration, operator’s driving privilege, or both be suspended for lack of adequate insurance? Who will be responsible for suspending the registration and preventing reinstatement unless the civil penalties are paid? Who will be responsible for making the related system changes and when will these changes be made?

e. Will the Vendor’s call center have to handle calls related to suspension clearance or civil penalties? If yes, what kind of access will the Vendor’s call center have to Mississippi’s registration systems and/or the required data?

Response: a) This has not yet been determined, but it is believed that fines will be processed through the court of proper jurisdiction.

b) The Department of Public Safety will be responsible for tracking convictions and will make, and be responsible for the cost of, related system changes.

c) This has not yet been determined, but it is believed that fines will be processed through the court of proper jurisdiction.

d) The specifics of this have not yet been determined but only DOR can suspend vehicle registrations and only DPS can suspend driving privileges.

e) This has not yet been determined as it is not clear which department will impose the penalties. Vendor should propose a recommended approach based on Vendor's experience in other States. DPS and DOR will work with the awarded Vendor to provide access to view records.

Question 58: Page 97: Section 8 (4) of the SENATE BILL NO. 2631 states "Failure of the owner or the operator of a motor vehicle to have the insurance card in the motor vehicle is a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, is punishable by a fine of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) and suspension of driving privilege for a period of one (1) year or until the owner of the motor vehicle shows proof of liability insurance that is in compliance with the liability limits required by Section 63-15-3(j). Fraudulent use of an insurance card shall be punishable in accordance with Section 97-7-10. The funds from such fines shall be deposited in the State General Fund in the State Treasury.A person convicted of a criminal offense under this subsection (4) shall not be convicted of a civil violation under Section 7(1) of this act arising from the same incident. "

a. The above section seems to indicate that if the operator of an uninsured vehicle does not have an insurance card in the motor vehicle, they will be issued a criminal penalty (misdemeanor) and shall not be convicted of a civil violation for lack of insurance. The funds from the criminal penalty will go into the State General Fund and not the Uninsured Motorist Identification Fund. Is our interpretation of the law correct?

Response: Yes, but this is subject to court interpretation.

Question 59: General, How many UM tickets are currently issued annually?

Response: For Calendar Year 2011:

Uninsured Motorist Citations	Count
Guilty: Fine under \$500	24,832
Guilty: Fine \$500 or Greater	7,535
Not Guilty	1,837
Dismissed	6,944

Pending (Fail To Appear)	6,531
Defensive Driving school	10
Total	47,689
Total Collected by Courts	\$9,419,184.00
Guilty with \$0 Recorded (3%)	1,053

Question 60: General, How many MS registered vehicles are there which meet the requirements for insurance verification?

Response: **2.4 to 2.5 million out of the 2.8 registered vehicles meet the requirements for insurance verification.**

Question 61: General, What is the estimated UM rate in MS?

Response: **Per the Insurance Research Council (IRC) in 2009 the percentage of uninsured motorists in Mississippi was 28%.**

Question 62: General, Is MS currently collecting civil penalties compliant with the new legislation which was effective July1, 2012?

Response: **No.**

Question 63: General, How much money is currently in the Uninsured Motorist fund?

Response: **\$0.00.**

Question 64: General, Is the vendor responsible for collecting suspension fees? Clearing suspensions?

Response: **DPS and DOR will work with the awarded Vendor to achieve a suitable process for vehicle and driver suspensions.**

Question 65: General, Does the driver system reside with DPS and the vehicle system with DOR? How will a single uninsured suspension suspend both the DL and the vehicle?

Response: **Yes. The specifics for how suspensions will be handled have not yet been determined.**

Question 66: General, Will the State extend the opening date of the RFP which is currently 10/25/12? The answers to the questions listed are critical in the development of our response to this RFP which will be provided on 10/17/12. Combined with the complexity and detailed requirements listed in the RFP additional time would allow for a more appropriately detailed Vendor response.

Response: Please refer to amendment #2 above for a revised schedule.

Question 67: Page 2 - ITS RFP Response Checklist

Are Vendors required to include a completed checklist within the submitted response?

Response: No, this checklist is provided to help the Vendor submit a complete proposal.

Question 68: Page 12 – Paragraph No. 13 - Vendor Personnel Section

Are Vendors required to submit the information in this section with the response?

Response: Yes.

Question 69: Page 34 - Paragraph No. 3.3

During the 2012 Regular Session, the Mississippi Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 2631 to create the Public Safety Verification and Enforcement Act. This Act requires DPS, in cooperation with DOI and DOR, to establish an accessible common carrier-based motor vehicle insurance verification system to be used by law enforcement agencies and the DOR to identify uninsured motorists. Please provide the State's best estimate for the uninsured motorist rate (percentage) in Mississippi.

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 61 above.

Question 70: Page 34 - Paragraph No. 3.8

The State requires a business model whereby the Vendor provides MSVIVS products, implementation, and services, including changes to the Law Enforcement Network and support of changes to the Title Registration Network, at no up-front cost to the State. The business model must generate sufficient revenue to fully sustain the MSVIVS system, including ongoing operating costs, going forward. The State is open to consideration of alternative business models. Vendor must include a concise overview of Vendor's primary or recommended business model, as well as any alternative models the State may want to consider. The business model overview must include any assumptions Vendor makes in developing the business model and the in developing the Revenue Information Submission requested in Section VIII. For the Law Enforcement Network, the State provided Exhibit C containing the costs which must be borne by the vendor. However, no exhibit was provided for the Title Registration Network. If the vendor must bear these costs, please identify them.

Response: The awarded Vendor will not be responsible for modifications required to the Title Registration Network. Costs associated with Title Network relate to storage costs for the file to reside on the mainframe at the State Data Center. State Data Center hosting charges for the daily file to be used by the Title Registration Network will be calculated based on the size of the file at \$0.00065 per 1,000 track-hours.

Question 71: The State's objectives for this project include the implementation of a MSVIVS system that includes a web portal and permits current internal State systems, or authorized users of an MSVIVS web portal or service, to access MSVIVS to perform insurance verification transactions with minimum inconvenience to State system users and maximum integration with current workflows where possible. What is the total expected number of authorized users?

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 39 above.

Question 72: Page 35 - Paragraph No. 4.2.3
Mississippi court and other agency access to MSVIVS will be made from web portal transactions accessed through existing desktop workstation equipment. Please provide further clarification and definition of other agency access and the volume of users expected in this category.

Response: Please refer to the response to Question 39 above.

Question 73: Page 35 - Paragraph No. 4.2.4
Access to MSVIVS will be initiated through the State's Title Registration Network, which is used for registration, titling, and other motor vehicle transactions. The Title Registration Network is a mainframe system developed back in 1970. The data is housed at ITS and the system is developed and maintained in COBOL CICS. The tax collector offices throughout the state use the transactions available within the Title Registration Network for registration, titling and other motor vehicle transactions. Vendor must provide a daily file of insurance records created and placed on the ITS mainframe for state use. Please provide the approximate number of active registrations currently in DOR's system.

Response: 2.8 million

Question 74: Page 35 - Paragraph No. 4.2.4
Access to MSVIVS will be initiated through the State's Title Registration Network, which is used for registration, titling, and other motor vehicle transactions. The Title Registration Network is a mainframe system developed back in 1970. The data is housed at ITS and the system is developed and maintained in COBOL CICS. The tax collector offices throughout the state use the transactions available within the Title Registration Network for registration, titling and other motor vehicle transactions. Vendor must provide a daily file of insurance records created and placed on the ITS mainframe for state use. Please provide the approximate number of active registrations which are considered commercial.

Response: 300,000 – 400,000

Question 75: Page 37 - Paragraph No. 4.8

Queries will be initiated by Title Registration Network users through Title Registration Network transactions. Please elaborate on the required interaction between the vendor's system and the Title Registration Network, in this section and in Section VII, Item 18.1.8. Is this reference to the daily file upload described elsewhere in the RFP, or is some other interaction anticipated?

Response: This refers to the file that the Vendor must provide DOR that will reside on the mainframe at the State Data Center.

Question 76: Page 37 - Paragraph No. 4.11

Vendor will handle all contact with motor vehicle insurance providers and subsequent updates to and maintenance of MSVIVS data within MSVIVS. This specifically includes working with insurance providers to ensure insurance data is correct, current, and available through MSVIVS in a timely manner. Vendor must assume responsibility for working with insurance providers to handle DOR customer queries regarding MSVIVS data. DOR customers will be directed to contact Vendor or Vendor's designee (e.g. insurance providers) for queries regarding MSVIVS data. Please provide DOI's listing of all Mississippi insurers current authorized to write non-commercial mandatory liability insurance policies, and their respective NAIC codes.

Response: Please refer to the list attached as Exhibit A.

Question 77: Page 41 - Paragraph No. 9.2

Because Mississippi has duplicate VIN and plate number situations the batch matching process must be able to use sufficient field identifiers for Mississippi data to get unique matches. List the key fields your system currently uses for matching and describe how your system will uniquely identify vehicles when duplicates are encountered. Does the State have a unique identifier for registered vehicles, or are vehicles identified by VIN or plate number?

Response: Vehicles are identified by VIN number.

Question 78: Page 48 - Paragraph No. 17.2

The Vendor must provide a call center to provide assistance to Mississippi citizens who call with issues between the Vendor's data and the insurance companies that are providing the data. Describe how you will provide support to Mississippi citizens who need to clear up insurance reporting issues. This call center must be available continuously during the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM local Mississippi time. Please confirm that this requirement refers to Monday through Friday.

Response: Please refer to amendment #5 above.

Question 79: Page 49 - Paragraph No.18.1.1

Contract signing complete (November 1, 2012). Please state the minimum and maximum number of years for the contract.

Response: Please refer to Amendment #6 and the Response to Question 5 above.

Question 80: What specific things need to be included in the on-site demonstration?

Response: The State would expect to see overviews of Vendor's process, data flows, and general functionality of the proposed system. A demonstration of available user interfaces with a live view of a sister state's implementation would be desirable. Vendor should be prepared to demonstrate any features Vendor feels will distinguish Vendor's system from other candidates.

Question 81: In an attempt to respond to Section VIII it would be necessary to understand the current costs to support insurance compliance as well as the ability to generate revenue for the new methods being proposed. What are all of the specific fees (e.g., re-instatement) that the state may charge in the event of demonstration of lack of insurance, driving without insurance etc.? What are the costs to support the current enforcement? What other assumption should be made to determine all internal savings to the state?

Response: As Mississippi has no existing verification process, the State has no way to accurately estimate volume. The fee structure is detailed in Senate Bill 2631 Section 7, attached to the RFP as Exhibit B. Refer to Question 59 above for the number of citations issued under current law enforcement efforts. Vendor should base assumptions on Vendor's experience in the implementation of similar programs in other states. Vendor should list all assumptions made as required in the RFP.

Question 82: Does the state mandate the reporting of insurance (Book of Business) for all companies? If exceptions, please specify

Response: Book of Business data is not mandated, but may be necessary for meeting the requirements laid forth in Senate Bill 2631 Section 2 (3) (f).

Question 83: Does the state require that all insurance companies report insurance status through a web service? If exceptions, please specify.

Response: Exceptions are required for low-volume insurers as stated in Senate Bill 2631 2 (3) (g).

Question 84: In Section 12.3, a reference is made to peak traffic. What is the specific time and can you provide any load statistics?

Response: The state has no historical metrics. Vendor should base his proposal on Vendor's experience in other states.

Question 85: Section 18 refers to various target dates. Section 18.1.2 refers to a test database ready on January 1, 2013. Section 18.1.7 refers to a verification tool used in an advisory capacity. Should we assume this would be testing a web service request against the test database?

Response: Vendor should propose a recommended test plan that meets the requirements as laid out in the RFP based on Vendor's experience implementing similar systems in other states. Vendor should detail any assumptions Vendor makes in developing the project plan, test plan, and business model. Law enforcement testing will be done against live until the requirements for moving the system to production as laid out in the contract and RFP are met.

Question 86: There is not a one to one correspondence between the scoring referenced in Section 24.2 and the areas titled in the Technical Questions. Can you clarify?

Response: The State will review each requirement and make a determination as to which category points associated with that requirement should be attributed. The selection will be based on generally accepted definitions of the category titles. This will be completed before proposals are opened and evaluated.

Question 87: Section 24.3 refers to the highest payments to the state in the calculation of 24.3.1 but lists Lifecycle Costs in section 24.3.2. Will the Vendor be evaluated on the costs to implement the proposed solution over the life of the contract or will they be evaluated on the difference between the Revenues to the state and the costs incurred?

Response: The State will evaluate both Revenues and costs as we evaluate proposals looking for the overall best benefit to the state. Costs will be deducted from Revenue to determine the best net value.

Question 88: What is the number of registered vehicles that will be eligible for tracking?

Response: 2.4 to 2.5 million out of the 2.8 registered vehicles

RFP responses are due October 30, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. (Central Time).

If you have any questions concerning the information above, or if we can be of further assistance, please contact Renée Murray at 601-432-8146 or via email at Renee.Murray@its.ms.gov.

Attachment: Exhibit A: Mississippi Insurer Listing

cc: ITS Project File Number 39947